

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/773,387	02/01/2001	Andrew Brookfield Swaine	550-205	3984

7590 07/16/2004

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.  
8th Floor  
1100 North Glebe Road  
Arlington, VA 22201

EXAMINER


RUTTEN, JAMES D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2122

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/773,387	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SWAINE ET AL. 	
	<b>Examiner</b> J. Derek Rutten	<b>Art Unit</b> 2122	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Acknowledgement is made of Applicants' amendment dated April 28 2004, responding to the January 29 2004 Office Action provided in the rejection of claims 1-13, wherein claims 6, 11, and 13 have been amended, and claims 14-20 have been added. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application and have been fully considered by the examiner.
2. Applicant's arguments, see bottom of page 12 through page 13, filed April 28 2004, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 2, 7-10, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of U.S. Patent 6,681,321 to Dale et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Dale").

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 15 is dependent upon later claim 16. Dependent claims should follow the base claims from which they depend (37 CFR 1.75(c)). However, comparison of this claim with prior claim 2 suggests that this is simply a typo, and that claim 15 is intended to be dependent upon claim 14. Therefore, this claim will be presumed to have a typo and that line 1 of the claim should instead read --Apparatus as claimed in claim 14--. Appropriate clarification and correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 11 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claim 11 recites the limitation "both behaviors" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purpose of further examination this limitation will be interpreted in light of page 12 line 31 through page 13 line 2 of the originally filed specification as "~~both~~ two behaviors simultaneously wherein the behaviors consist of: (i) said exact match signal is user configurable; and (ii) said exact match signal is set under hardware control depending upon a use of said trigger condition." Applicant's attempt to remedy the defects of claim 11 is noted on page 10 of the response, but it is not clear from the amendment how this has been remedied.

7. Claim 24 recites the limitation "both behaviors" in line 2, as described in the above rejection of claim 11. However, this claim is dependent upon claim 14, which does not allow for the above interpretation of claim 11 with respect to claim 24. However, as discussed in the objection of claim 15, dependency upon claim 14 will be presumed to be a typo and will be interpreted as being dependent instead upon claim 21. Further, the claimed limitation of "both behaviors" will be interpreted with respect to the above rejection of claim 11.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. Claims 1-4, 7, 12-17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the "Description of the Prior Art" section on pages 2 and 3 of the originally filed specification (hereinafter referred to as "DPA") in view of Dale.

As per claim 1, DPA discloses:

*(i) a processing circuit operable to process data values under control of processing instructions;*

*(ii) a memory operable to store data values to be processed, said processing circuit being responsive to a data access instruction to access a data value stored within said memory; and*

*(iii) a tracing circuit operable to generate a stream of trace data identifying processing instructions executed and data values accessed by said processing circuit;*

(See page 2, lines 13-15: "Tracing the **activity** of a data processing system whereby a **trace stream is generated** including **data** representing the step-by-step activity within the system is a highly useful tool in system development."; also page 2, lines 19-21: "Examples of such on-chip tracing mechanisms are the **Embedded Trace Macrocell** provided by ARM Limited, Cambridge, England in association with their **ARM7 and ARM9 processors**." ARM7 and ARM9 processors inherently process data values under control of processing instructions, otherwise they would not have any functional value. They also contain memory for data storage and inherently use access instructions for accessing the data from memory, otherwise they would not be able to process the data. The Embedded Trace Macrocell, or "ETM", is the tracing circuit that identifies instructions and data used by the ARM chip. Note that further information regarding ARM9 processors can be found in "ARM966E-S: Technical Reference Manual" by ARM Limited.)

Art Unit: 2122

*wherein*

*(iv) a data access instruction may result in a data miss such that a data value corresponding to said data access instruction is accessed upon a processing cycle subsequent to that upon which said access would occur without said data miss (page 3 lines 5-12: “However, should a **load miss** occur whereby **the load of the data value cannot be satisfied** from the cache and requires a slower non-cache access, such as to a main memory, then the **data value will not be returned for possibly many processing cycles**. Rather than halt data processing, it is known to provide systems, such as the ARM1020T processor, in which other program instructions can continue to execute whilst the data from the previous load miss is still awaited providing those later instructions do not require or depend on the data value that has not yet been retrieved.”).*

DPA does not disclose generating a data placeholder or insertion of late data into a data stream.

However, in an analogous environment, Dale teaches:

*(v) said tracing circuit is responsive to said data miss to generate a data placeholder within said stream of trace data at a position where data identifying said data value would have been placed if said data miss had not occurred (column 2 lines 16-19: “As instructions are scheduled, unique **identifier information** for the scheduled instructions is stored in the trace storage device in association with the address information of the instructions.”) and then, when said access to said data value does occur, to insert at a later point in said stream of trace data a late data*

Art Unit: 2122

*value identifying said data value* (column 2 lines 7-10: "When a cache load is necessary to obtain instructions that are not already stored in the instruction cache or data that is not already stored in the data cache, **updated cache information is stored in the trace storage device.**").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Dale's identifier information in the tracing circuit of DPA. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to collect accurate non-disruptive execution traces of out-of-order processors in order to examine program behavior.

As per claim 2, the above rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. DPA further discloses *the apparatus as claimed in claim 1, wherein said memory comprises a cache memory and a main memory, a data miss occurring when a data value being accessed is not stored within said cache memory* (DPA page 3 lines 5-8).

As per claim 3, the above rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. DPA does not expressly disclose tag values. However, in an analogous environment, Dale teaches *said data place holder includes a tag value and said late data value includes a matching tag value* (column 7 line 52 – column 8 line 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Dale's tags with the tracing circuit of DPA. One of ordinary



Art Unit: 2122

skill in the art would have been motivated to correlate two pieces of data for further analysis.

As per claim 4, the above rejection of claim 3 is incorporated. DPA does not expressly disclose late data values generated in a different order than their corresponding data misses. However, Dale teaches out-of-order execution and the collection of data in a different order than the instructions issued (column 5 line 45-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Dale's handling of out-of-order execution in the tracing circuit of DPA. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to anticipate the varying latencies between different elements of a memory hierarchy to ensure the proper collection of data.

As per claim 7, DPA further discloses *the apparatus as claimed in claim 1, wherein said tracing circuit is operable to control tracing operation in response to a trigger condition associated with one or more of said data value and a memory address associated with said data value* (page 2 lines 19-21. Trigger conditions are supported by the Embedded Trace Macrocell.).

As per claim 12, DPA also/further discloses a method (page 2 lines 13-15: "step-by-step"). All other limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claim 1.

Art Unit: 2122

As per claim 13, DPA discloses *controlling a data processing apparatus to analyze a stream of trace data* (as addressed in the above rejection of claim 12). DPA does not expressly disclose a computer program product. However, Dale teaches the use of a computer program product (column 11 line 37 – column 12 line 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Dale's computer program product with the tracing circuit of DPA. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to sell and distribute the computer program.

All other limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claim 12.

As per claim 14, DPA discloses an apparatus for processing data (page 2 lines 19-21). All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claim 1.

As per claims 15-17 and 20, the above rejection of claim 14 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejections of claims 2-4 and 7, respectively.

9. Claims 5 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of DPA and Dale as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of prior art of record U.S. Patent 5,555,392 to Chaput et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Chaput").

As per claim 5, the combination of DPA and Dale does not disclose *the apparatus as claimed in claim 1, wherein said data place holder includes data identifying how many outstanding late data values are awaited at that time.*

However, in an analogous environment, Chaput teaches the use of a field for counting the number of outstanding load misses (column 3 lines 35-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Chaput's load miss field with the combination of DPA and Westcott's tracing mechanism. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to track the status of pending load operations.

As per claim 18, the above rejection of claim 14 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claim 5.

10. Claims 6 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of DPA and Dale as applied to claims 1 and 14, respectively above, and further in view of prior art of record Chaput, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,009,270 to Mann (hereinafter referred to as "Mann").

As per claim 6, the rejection of claims 1 and 5 are incorporated. DPA and Dale do not expressly disclose *the apparatus as claimed in claim 1, wherein said stream of trace data includes periodic synchronising data, said synchronising data including data identifying how many outstanding late data values are awaited at that time.*

However, in an analogous environment, Chaput teaches the use of a field for counting the number of outstanding load misses (column 3 lines 35-36). Further Mann teaches input of synchronization information into a data trace (column 2 lines 60-64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Mann's synchronization stream with Chaput's outstanding load miss count with DPA and Dale's tracing circuit. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to provide synchronization information to a tracing circuit to allow proper trace collection.

As per claim 19, the above rejection of claim 14 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claim 6.

11. Claims 8-10 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of DPA and Dale as applied to claims 7 and 20, respectively above, in view of prior art of record European Patent Application Publication 0 465 765 A2, "Instruction Sampling Instrumentation" by Westcott and White (hereinafter referred to as "Westcott").

As per claim 8, the above rejection of claim 7 is incorporated. DPA does not expressly disclose *wherein said tracing circuit is responsive to an exact match signal such that a trigger condition associated with a data value for which a data miss occurs is either:*

*(i) not triggered until said data value is accessed and found to meet said trigger condition; or*

*(ii) triggered upon said data miss upon an assumption that said data value when accessed will meet said trigger condition.*

However, in an analogous environment, Westcott teaches using a sample pulse signal to indicate a match reactive to a trigger condition associated with a data value (See column 6 lines 7-15 and 26-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Westcott's trigger with DPA's tracing circuit. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to collect only that data which is of particular interest and which meets a selected requirement.

As per claim 9, the above rejection of claim 8 is incorporated. DPA does not expressly disclose *the apparatus as claimed in claim 8, wherein said exact match signal is user configurable.*

However, in an analogous environment, Westcott teaches user selected trigger conditions (column 6 lines 7-11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Westcott's user selected trigger conditions with DPA's trigger circuit. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to collect only that data which is of particular interest.

Art Unit: 2122

As per claim 10, the above rejection of claim 8 is incorporated. DPA does not expressly disclose *the apparatus as claimed in claim 8, wherein said exact match signal is set under hardware control depending upon a use of said trigger condition.*

However, in an analogous environment, Westcott teaches event selection (match signal) based on a trigger condition (column 6 lines 45-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Westcott's hardware event selection with DPA trigger circuit. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to provide an automatic signal for triggering.

As per claims 21-23, the above rejection of claim 20 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejections of claims 8-10, respectively.

12. Claims 11 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of DPA, Dale and Westcott as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of prior art of record U.S. Patent 5,978,742 to Pickerd (hereinafter referred to as "Pickerd").

As per claim 11, the above rejection of claim 8 is incorporated. DPA does not expressly disclose: *the apparatus as claimed in claim 8, wherein said exact match signal has different values in different parts of said tracing circuit to provide two behaviors simultaneously wherein the behaviors consist of:*

*(i) said exact match signal is user configurable; and*

Art Unit: 2122

*(ii) said exact match signal is set under hardware control depending upon a use of said trigger condition.*

However, in an analogous environment, Westcott teaches user selected trigger conditions (column 6 lines 7-11), and event selection (*match signal*) based on a trigger condition (column 6 lines 45-47).

Further, in an analogous environment, Pickerd teaches a circuit providing two trigger behaviors simultaneously (column 9 lines 36-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Pickerd's simultaneous trigger events and Westcott's behaviors with DPA's tracing circuit. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to collect information relating to multiple trigger events to enable further customization.

As per claim 24, the above rejection of claim 21 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claim 11.

### ***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Derek Rutten whose telephone number is (703) 605-5233. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (703) 305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2122

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jdr

  
**WEI Y. ZHEN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

**WEI Y. ZHEN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**